RealClear Opinion Research

Methodology Statement

From September 26 – October 4, 2020 Real Clear Opinion Research surveyed N=895 registered voters in Chicago. The results of this survey include interviews conducted over the telephone and online.

A probability-based telephone survey of n=548 likely voters was conducted using a voter file that was obtained from L2. Interviewers from Dynata Research randomly selected numbers to call from the voter file and interviewers asked to speak with the person named in the database. Gender and age verification were performed to ensure the correct respondent was contacted. Both cell phones and landlines were included. All interviews were conducted in English. The sample was divided by neighborhood. Weighting was used to account for non-response error and weighted to match the geodemographic composition of the voter file on the key variables of age, gender, Illinois State House District, educational attainment, past voting history and partisanship. The data were weighted using a raking methodology.

These interviews were supplemented with a non-probability-based sample of registered voters in Chicago (n=347). The sample for this aspect of the survey was obtained from the Dynata and PureSpectrum marketplaces. Additionally, data were vetted on a case-by-base basis to ensure response quality. For the online sample, stratified matching to the voter file was employed to facilitate age, gender, and party identification sampling quotas. Age and gender quotas were interlocked during the fielding process. A raking methodology was used to both weight the data to geodemographic targets (age, race, gender, neighborhood, party registration, and education attainment), and calibrated to account for online propensity and other known attitudinal biases present in an online sample. Additionally, calibration included matching to the previous turnout in 2016 and 2018 general elections. The data was then trimmed to remove any cases with outlier weights.

The telephone and online samples were combined using their established weights. An unequal design effect was computed for both the telephone and online samples. To compute design effects, a variety of factors were used. For the telephone study, non-response bias was the primary weighting factor. Within the non-weighted telephone sample, age and infrequent voting history were the primary factors accounted for in assessing non-response bias. Specifically, the telephone sample lacked coverage of voters who voted in 2016 but did not vote in 2018. For the online sample, non-coverage by age was a primary concern. The two sets of weights were combined in proportion to their design effects. A final weight between the two samples was calculated, and the online sample was weighted to account for 32% of respondents and the telephone sample accounted for the remaining 68% of respondents. Lastly, the weights were re-raked using both demographic targets for weighting and behavioral targets for calibration.